

VZCZCXYZ0010
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #0746/01 3451505
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
O 111505Z DEC 09
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3570
INFO RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY
RUCPDOG/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY
RHMFIUU/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC//OSAC PRIORITY

UNCLAS THE HAGUE 000746

SENSITIVE
SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCA, L/NPV, IO/MPR,
SECDEF FOR OSD/GSA/CN,CP>
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC
COMMERCE FOR BIS (BROWN, DENYER AND CRISTOFARO)
NSC FOR LUTES
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)
SUBJECT: CWC: WRAP-UP FOR THE CONFERENCE OF THE STATES
PARTIES (CSP 14), NOVEMBER 30 - DECEMBER 4, 2009

REF: A. THE HAGUE 719
[B.](#) STATE 12230
[C.](#) THE HAGUE 738

This is CWC-73-09

SUMMARY AND INTRODUCTION

[1.](#) (SBU) The 14th Conference of the States Parties (CSP) unanimously approved the appointment of Ambassador Ahmet Uzumcu of Turkey as the next Director-General (DG) for the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), to begin his four-year term in July 2010. The Conference was characterized by an unusually high number of speakers in the General Debate and by remarkably little controversy on most of the main agenda items, including the 2010 Program and Budget and the election of new members to the Executive Council (EC). Compromise language on the final destruction deadlines for the report was reached fairly quickly among key delegations and accepted without change by the rest. The final three days of the CSP, indeed filling the time available, were spent on consultations on Articles VII (national implementation) and XI (economic and technological development), with delegations arguing over the format of the report for the former and a brainstorming workshop for the latter. Both reached final agreement on Friday evening on the last day of the Conference, to everyone's relief.

[2.](#) (SBU) Assistant to the Secretary of Defense Andrew Weber participated in the first two days of the Conference and held a broad range of productive meetings, including with Director-General Pfirter, newly appointed DG Uzumcu, and an open meeting on the U.S. destruction program, which was attended by a standing-room-only crowd. These meetings are being reported by septel.

[3.](#) (SBU) The U.S. Delegation also met bilaterally with the Iraqi delegation several times and with

the Technical Secretariat to discuss next steps on Iraq's chemical weapons sites (ref C). Other bilateral meetings on the margins of the CSP included a meeting with the Israeli delegation, an industry discussion with India, a meeting with the Algerian delegation on the proposed conference on chemical safety and security in Algiers, and a meeting with the Libyan delegation on its destruction and conversion programs (reported by septel).

DG'S STATEMENT AND THOUGHTS FOR HIS LEGACY

14. (SBU) In his final address to the Conference as Director-General, Rogelio Pfirter provided his customary detailed overview of the Organization's activities during the year. Running from an update on the status of destruction to congratulating Uzumcu, the DG concluded his 80-minute statement with some personal thoughts on issues facing the Organization. Pfirter noted that the OPCW is in better shape than when he arrived in 2002, but he also acknowledged that there are important challenges ahead, including destruction, non-proliferation and matters on which the Convention is ambiguous. On destruction, Pfirter opined that deadlines are not an end in and of themselves but rather a means toward complete disarmament. He Qrather a means toward complete disarmament. He stated that, after 2012, there likely still will be non-member states in possession of chemical

weapons; they should be given the chance to join the Convention and destroy their stockpiles. Pfirter said the Convention will remain successful if it can respond to challenges posed by destruction. He also reiterated the suggestion that a special meeting of all member states should be convened before 2012 to address the issue.

15. (SBU) On non-proliferation, Pfirter reaffirmed his conviction that the increase in Other Chemical Production Facilities (OCPF) inspections has been the right thing to do, despite any difficulties posed by the Convention's annual cap on OCPF and Schedule 3 inspections. However, he stated that the present approach to industry verification is unable to provide adequate levels of verification. Noting that the necessary increases in staff and resources to significantly ramp up inspections are unlikely to be approved, Pfirter suggested adopting a complementary approach: having National Authorities inspect relevant sites in addition to the regular inspections carried out by TS inspectors (ref A). He said that this would help share the burden of non-proliferation activities between the TS and national authorities, but he stressed that any arrangement would need to be predicated on important preconditions, such as having a properly function National Authority and regular auditing and spot checks by the TS. For Pfirter's final point on matters on which the Convention is ambiguous or silent, he highlighted incapacitants and non-lethal weapons. He suggested that the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) could shed some light on their relevance to the Convention and that the Third Review Conference might be a good forum in which to discuss the issue.

16. (U) The full text of Pfirter's official statement and personal remarks is available as an official OPCW Conference document (C-14/DG.13).

GENERAL DEBATE

¶7. (SBU) Fifty-two national statements were delivered during the General Debate, the highest number in recent history. Nearly all the speeches praised outgoing Director-General Pfirter, welcomed the appointment of new DG Uzumcu, and urged universal membership in the Chemical Weapons Convention. Many lauded the tradition of consensus in the Organization, particularly in the process to appoint the next DG. A number of statements supported better targeting of sites for chemical industry inspections, although western countries supported additional inspections of Other Chemical Production Facilities (OCPFs) while the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) states called for political agreement on criteria before increasing the number of inspections. Many countries supported greater efforts in countering terrorism. Western countries advocated full implementation of Article VII obligations, while NAM countries spoke of the importance of full implementation of Article XI for international trade and cooperation.

¶8. (U) The group statements (EU, NAM and African states) and almost all of the national statements expressed concern over the potential delays in meeting the final extended destruction deadline. Meeting the final extended destruction deadline under the Convention. Some referred to the "challenging times" ahead, and whether by name or insinuation, the United States was singled out for particular concern over its stated likely inability to meet the deadline. In this regard, several statements contended that the ability to meet the

2012 deadline will impact the integrity of the Convention. Some welcomed the consultations under the Executive Council Chairman to discuss how the Organization might address states' inability to meet the final extended deadline for destruction. The Mexican Ambassador (the current EC Chairman) emphasized the importance of working by consensus, as the Organization had just demonstrated in the DG selection process, and encouraged all States Parties to engage in open and transparent dialogue on the deadline issue, with the aim of the debate to strengthen, not debilitate, the Convention. The Brazilian statement repeated this theme that the delays in destruction are a common challenge to all States Parties.

¶9. (U) The Indian statement offered Indian expertise and experience to assist other possessor states in meeting the 2012 deadline. Australia acknowledged the challenge of meeting the deadline, noted the significant achievements that have been made, and encouraged constructive discussion of the issue. The Australian statement also announced the recent discovery of old chemical weapons in Queensland and stated that the most appropriate destruction methods were being sought. Malaysia offered the most dramatic statement on destruction, quoting President Obama, Gandhi and a CNN slogan: "If you want change we can believe in, you must be the change."

¶10. (U) The Russian statement confidently expressed movement toward the goal of full destruction, not least because it had met its third interim deadline to destroy 45% of its declared stockpile one month in advance. Russia then listed every country, including the United States, which provided donor money to Russia's destruction program. However, Russia warned that its ability to meet the 2012 deadline on-time is dependent on donor countries' abilities to timely deliver funding. Russia also expressed concern over the delay of the initial Secretariat visit to Iraq following its initial

declaration.

¶11. (U) The African group statement included support for Libya's destruction extension request, endorsement of the facilitation on "situations unforeseen" by the Convention which should help to prevent any undermining of the CWC, and a call for equitable geographic and gender representation in the Secretariat.

¶12. (U) The Iranian statement was somewhat more moderate in tone compared to the political diatribes delivered in the past. It even thanked outgoing CSP Chairman Shibuya (Japan) for his work, despite the fact that his Chairman's report last year was a major bone of contention for Iran when they broke consensus and the Conference failed for the first time to adopt its report. Iran called on the Executive Council not just to consult on the destruction deadlines but to form working groups on the matter as "time is of the essence."

¶13. (U) Iraq followed Iran's emotional "never again" theme after the use of chemical weapons by Saddam Hussein's regime in both Iran and Iraq. The Iraqi statement briefly outlined plans for addressing security and assessing the sites of the former chemical program, and it thanked the U.S. and other donors for current and future support.

¶14. (U) By the end of two days of debate, the statements largely blended together. However, the Costa Rican Ambassador took the floor last to deliver two speeches, the first on behalf of the

Latin Group (GRULAC) praising two of their sons, EC Chairman Lomonaco (Mexico) and DG Pfirter (Argentina). He then made a very personal address calling for the "proliferation" of new chemical weapons to fight AIDS and global warming and to transform the world for everyone's children.

APPOINTMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL AND EC MEMBERS

¶15. (U) Most of the items on the Conference Agenda were approved quickly and with little debate on December 2. New members of the Executive Council were elected: Algeria, Kenya, Libya and South Africa for the African Group; Iran, Iraq, Pakistan and Sri Lanka for the Asian Group; Albania, Romania and Russia for the Eastern European Group; Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba and Ecuador for the Latin American and Caribbean Group; Canada, Denmark, Luxembourg, Spain and Turkey for the Western European and Others Group.

¶16. (U) The appointment of the new Director-General was timed for noon on Wednesday, December 2, so that heads of delegation (and the Turkish press) could attend. Uzumcu gave a brief speech thanking everyone and noting the challenges he would need to address. DG Pfirter congratulated him and offered full assistance in the transition to his tenure. The Chairman of the Conference limited debate to the coordinators of the regional groups since so many of the national statements had already welcomed the new DG. As the meeting was adjourned for lunch, Uzumcu shook hands with a long line of delegates.

THE BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

¶17. (SBU) With agreement on the draft 2010 program

and budget having been reached during the EC's October session, budget and administrative matters were uncontentious during the CSP. The Conference approved the 2010 program and budget without any debate. In addition to noting a number of regular reports, the only other substantive actions taken by the Conference were adoption of the scale of assessments for 2010 and approval of IPSAS (International Public Sector Accounting Standards) as the OPCW's financial and accounting standard.

DESTRUCTION DEADLINES

¶18. (SBU) During the plenary session December 2 on progress in meeting the revised deadline for CS destruction, Iran intervened to announce that they required report language to address the destruction deadlines, and stated that they had circulated draft language to interested delegations for consideration. Ambassador Jorge Lomonaco (Mexico) took the floor to state that Iran's proposal expanded beyond report language and raised points of substance; he requested that the issue be discussed in plenary with all parties receiving a copy of the proposed text. The call for plenary discussions was supported by the delegations of Peru, Ireland, Costa Rica, Netherlands, Columbia, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The Conference Chairman, Ambassador Vaidotas Verba QThe Conference Chairman, Ambassador Vaidotas Verba (Lithuania) instructed that the draft language be circulated and continued discussion in the plenary later the same morning.

¶19. (SBU) Following distribution of the Iranian draft text, Ambassador Lomonaco intervened in both his capacity as head of the Mexican delegation and as Chairman of the Executive Council. He stated that he had two primary concerns with the text. The first was disagreement with the Iranian assertion that "the integrity and the credibility" of the Convention hinge solely on the destruction deadline. This concern was echoed by the Peruvian Ambassador, who stated that, while it is essential that the deadlines be met, the integrity and credibility of the Convention do not hinge on this, calling it an inversion of values. He further stated that "total and full destruction is the best way to uphold the Convention" and called for more optimism acknowledging the progress made to date by Possessor States.

¶20. (SBU) Ambassador Lomonaco's second concern was that the text pre-empted the outcome of the consultations entrusted to him as Chairman of the Executive Council based on the decision rendered at the 58th Session of the Council. He stated that these consultations need to be completed, something for which he and his successor would be responsible. Multiple delegations voiced similar concerns that the Iranian text pre-judged the future efforts of the Council (Costa Rica, Peru, the Netherlands, Columbia, Germany, the UK and the U.S.).

¶21. (SBU) Indonesia intervened to state that it is important that report language be included to serve as a reminder that "this is not a business as usual problem and cannot be dealt with as business as usual", deeming this an unprecedented event calling for unprecedented action. Cuba also intervened to state that this issue is of paramount importance and urged that the Conference start working on appropriate language.

¶22. (SBU) Ambassador Peter Goosen (South Africa)

intervened with a surprisingly constructive commentary. Goosen stated that the Conference should clarify that no action would be taken that would undermine the Convention or that would lead to re-writing the Convention, and that possessor states should be urged to meet their obligation as soon as possible. He stated that the Iranian proposal raised some concerns, most notably that this is a situation that should be managed but it is not a situation that holds this Convention to lack integrity or credibility. He suggested that the elements that should be addressed in report language were simply that delegations expressed concerns and urged possessor states to make all possible efforts to complete their destruction activity.

¶23. (SBU) Following the discussion in the plenary, a group of interested parties convened to review new text provided by South Africa following the lines of Goosen's remarks on the floor of the plenary. The group consisted of the Conference Chairman and delegations from the United States, Russia, Mexico, Iran, and South Africa. The group rapidly concluded negotiations to produce balanced, compromise text. When introduced at the plenary on December 4, Iran insisted that no changes be made to the compromise text. The Conference reviewed the language and approved it without further debate.

ARTICLES VII AND XI (OR BUST)

¶24. (SBU) As noted in Ref A, the main unresolved issues at the CSP were draft decisions on Articles VII (national implementation) and XI (economic and technological development). During the week, the facilitators for both issues -- Rami Adwan (Lebanon) for Article VII and Chen Kai (China) for Article XI -- held back-to-back consultations in order to resolve the relatively minor outstanding differences. With the resolution of report language on destruction by Thursday, final agreement on Articles VII and XI consumed the entire final day of the Conference, with Iran playing the lead role in dragging out the process.

¶25. (SBU) On Article VII, South Africa successfully mobilized other African delegations behind its insistence that the annual TS report on national implementation -- relatively unchanged since first appearing in 2004 -- be amended to only include data directly related to Article VII. The Swedish delegation, on behalf of the EU, vocally opposed what they viewed as South African micro-management of the TS. At one point during informal consultations, the Representative of San Marino spoke to defend the current report and counter South African claims that the report was a burden to small countries and unfairly portrayed any gaps in their national implementation as serious non-compliance. The ensuing debate turned attention on Article VII away from the broader issue of national implementation and focused it solely on the TS annual report. The African-EU discord was resolved with an agreement to split the annual report into two concurrent reports -- with the first report including some of the current indicators and the second report containing all other information in the current report -- provided that the reports be provided annually without the need to renew the Technical Secretariat's mandate each year. However, Iran objected to this final point, insisting that the report -- and the TS's mandate to provide the report to the Council and Conference

-- should be carefully examined and debated each year.

¶26. (SBU) Meanwhile, the draft decision on Article XI was much less contentious. A last-minute addition by the Czech Republic to include language

on the importance of program evaluation did little to stall the momentum behind the Article XI draft decision. Another last-minute intervention by Lebanon insisting that any stakeholders included in the proposed Article XI workshop should only come from member states -- a pointed attempt to exclude participation by Israel -- was easily resolved. By Friday morning, western delegations were faced with the virtually-agreed Article XI draft decision while the fate of the Article VII draft decision hung in the balance as a group of interested delegations tried to reach a compromise.

¶27. (SBU) Despite an effort by the General Committee to provide senior leadership to the facilitators, Adwan was left brokering a small room negotiation between Iran on the one side and the EU on the other. The WEOG coordinator worked to expand the participation to include regional Qto to expand the participation to include regional representatives from other groups. When Iran refused to budge, the U.S., GRULAC, Russian, South African and EU delegations around the table got up and insisted on moving the issue back into the plenary. After Adwan provided an update on the status of negotiations and Legal Advisor Onate described the effects of not passing decisions on either Article VII or XI, delegations agreed to attempt one final consultation to reach agreement on the Article VII draft decision.

¶28. (SBU) The consultation remained at an impasse, with Iran clearly isolated but blocking action, until German Ambassador Burkart offered compromise text that took out "annually" but referred to "annual reports". The Iranian delegation noted the "ambiguity" but agreed to the new language. They then insisted on removing the descriptor "full" from the Article VII decision title, almost torpedoing the whole thing. Russia, supported by the U.S., African and EU delegations, insisted that the implementation of Article VII be treated the same as that of Article XI. As the agreed Article XI draft decision was entitled "full implementation," the Russians and others said that either Article VII should also be entitled "full implementation" or that "full" should be dropped from both. The Cuban, Indian and Pakistani delegations countered that the issues should not be linked and that agreement on Article XI should not be re-opened. In the end, despite Russian protestations, Iran got its way, and delegations returned to the plenary and adopted both decisions just before 10:00 p.m. Friday night, concluding the Conference

¶29. (U) In the WEOG hotwash on December 8, Delrep offered a Shakespearian conclusion, "All's well that ends well." The Irish delegate responded, the more appropriate Shakespearian reference would be, "Much Ado about Nothing."

¶30. (U) Beik sends.
LEVIN